

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Each of the originally filed claims was rejected in view of prior art. In particular, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over May (US 6,211,613). Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May (US 6,211,613) in view of the Richard (US 6,759,945). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Telephone Interview with Examiner

The undersigned appreciates the Examiner's willingness to discuss the outstanding rejection by telephone, on August 29, 2006. During that teleconference, the Examiner stated that the foregoing amendment (i.e., insertion of the word "placed" in claim 1) would be sufficient to define over the cited art of record. However, the Examiner stated that the amendment would require additional searching. Therefore, this amendment is filed with an RCE application.

For completeness, however, Applicant sets forth the following additional comments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over May (US 6,211,613).

Claim 1 now recites:

1. An organic electroluminescent display, comprising:
an organic electroluminescent display (OLED) panel;
a reflective sheet; and
a brightness regulating film for light transmission placed between the organic electroluminescent display panel and the reflective sheet.

(Emphasis Added) Claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited

art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

As disclosed in col.1 line 55-62 of *May*, The contrast in organic EL displays can be improved, allowing a reduction in brightness requirements and therefore power for a given readability, by the use of a circular polariser. **This is placed in front of a display**, which has a reflective back electrode surface and light passes through the polarizer and is then completely absorbed by the polarizer. In addition, no figures shown in *May* disclose or illustrate formation of a brightness regulating film between an organic EL display panel and a reflective sheet. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that *May* fails to anticipate claim 1 (as amended). Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that *May* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized in claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above 102 rejections of claim 1 should be removed. Moreover, since claims 2-4 are dependent claims that depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims also are in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *May* (US 6,211,613) in view of the *Richard* (US 6,759,945).

Claim 1, however, recites “***a brightness regulating film for light transmission placed between the organic electroluminescent display (OLED) panel and the reflective sheet.***” The structure disclosed in Fig. 1 and 2, and related description thereof of the US 6,211,613 patent, fail to teach this. In this regard, *May* does not teach formation of a brightness regulating film formed between the OLED panel and the reflective sheet but teaches formation of a circular polarizer (i.e. reference numeral 14) in front of a glass substrate 12 (see Fig. 1) and formation of

an antireflection coating (i.e. reference numeral 16) placed on the viewing surface of the glass substrate 12 (See Fig. 2), both for improving contrast of an electroluminescent display.

Moreover, as illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2, and the related description thereof in the US 6,759,945 patent, **Richard does not teach formation of a brightness regulating film placed between an OLED panel and an reflective sheet.** Instead, Richard teaches that a variable reflectance mirror can be utilized as the internal rearview mirror 10 or the external mirrors 12 and 14 respectively positioned outside the driver and passenger doors of a vehicle (See Fig. 1). Fig. 2 of Richard illustrates a cross-sectional view of the variable reflectance mirror 200 according to the US 6,759,945 patent. Embodiments illustrated in Richard all relate to a mirror using in a vehicle but not a display of self-luminance capability as the organic electroluminescent display of the present application. Therefore, Applicants the claimed embodiments cannot properly be viewed as a suggested combination over the above cited references.

Furthermore, based on the functional completeness and independent operation of each of the above-cited references, there would be no reason to mix and match functional aspects of these references, and therefore no proper reason to combine the references. In addition, the brightness regulating film of the present application has an advantage for simultaneously adjusting light intensities from the OLED panel and environmental lights in which is not taught and/or suggested in any of the cited references.

Embodiments illustrated in Richard are all related to an mirror using in an vehicle but not a display of self-luminance capability as the organic electroluminescent display of the present application. Thus, the May and Richard references are non-analogous and therefore cannot be properly combined under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

A credit card authorization is provided to cover the fee of the accompanying RCE application. No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any additional fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500